

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful review of the present application and respectfully request examination of pending claims 1-20.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Herman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,954,826) in paper #3. Further, the Examiner rejected claim 8 as being anticipated by Mehring (U.S. Patent No. 5,675,729) and thereafter, rejected claims 8 and 12 as being anticipated by DeLong et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,947). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claims 1 and 15

Independent claim 1 recites “*providing a plurality of classes, each class capable of performing a particular task related to obtaining information from a specification...selecting a class from the plurality of classes based on the task requested by the received command...*” and independent claim 15 recites “*a plurality of classes, wherein each class is capable of performing a particular task related to obtaining information from a specification...a code segment that selects a class from the plurality of classes based on the task requested by the received command...*”

Herman et al. discloses a *class* in column 3, lines 27-30, “[i]f more than one specification file has been selected, a message may be displayed that indicates differences between the specification files (e.g. differences in *classes* supported)” and in col. 4, lines 62-65 to col. 5, lines 1-45; FIGs. 4, 5, and 6,

The user may initiate the data analysis by clicking "analyze *classes*" button 440 ("*class*" is a name used for Java program files)... in the example of FIG. 4, the number of each of the error types selected by the user that are found during the analysis is displayed next to the error type name in analysis criteria selection area 410, and a message indicating information about the analysis performed (e.g. "The *class* files analyzed do not conform to the specification files") is displayed in status message area 110 ... Title bar 425 identifies the content of column 445 as "*classes* analyzed." ... Column 445 lists the program (*class*) file name to which the result displayed in a row pertains ... Accordingly, the results shown in result display area 415 are sorted by program (*class*) file name.

Accordingly, Herman et al. discloses an analysis of the classes of a specification such that the graphics user interface (GUI) shown in Figures 1-7 displays the specification and class input files with the analyzed results.

In contrast with the recited independent claims, while Herman et al. teaches a specification with a plurality of classes, Herman et al. does not teach providing a plurality of classes such that *each class* is "*capable of performing a particular task* related to obtaining information from a specification." Because the disclosure of classes in Herman et al. do not disclose the classes *performing a particular task*, Herman et al. cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 15. Thus, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection.

Independent claim 8 and dependent claim 12

Further, independent claim 8 recites "...a code segment that identifies a *context* within the input specification...a code segment that parses the identified *context to obtain assertions*" and claim 12 recites "... wherein the *context* is a set of *circumstances related to the obtained assertions*."

1 In contrast, Mehring discloses a "JTAG (Joint Test Access Group)
2 specification, IEEE 1149.1 (col. 1, lines 46-47)" but does not disclose the analysis of
3 parsing a "context" to obtain "assertions." Specifically, Mehring teaches a counting
4 mechanism for monitoring events in a processor. Thus, the JTAG specification is
5 used to develop electrical components that can be examined for performance and
6 debugging information. Further, in col. 6, lines 53-67, an assertion control register
7 that has a bit asserted can indicate the state of an event that causes a trigger signal
8 within the electrical components. However, what Mehring does not teach is a
9 computer program for obtaining assertions from a specification for a computer
10 program such that a code segment parses the identified context to obtain assertions.

11 Similarly, DeLong et al. does not disclose the analysis of a "context to obtain
12 assertions." Specifically, DeLong et al. teaches an automated software test tool based
13 on a software specification using first order theory/language (col. 2, lines 61-67).
14 Thus, the assertion shown in Table 1 (col. 3, line 43) is an example of a relationship in
15 first order theory/language and a well-formed formulae (WFF) (col. 3, lines 13-15).
16 However, DeLong et al. does not teach the parsing of a context to obtain assertions
17 such as the assertions shown in Table 2 of the Specification (page 22). Table 2 shows
18 that an assertion can be "creates a string representation of the first argument in the
19 radix specified by the second argument." Because DeLong et al. does not teach the
20 assertions disclosed by the claimed invention, the reference cannot anticipate
21 independent claim 8.

Accordingly because Mehring and DeLong et al. do not disclose the analysis
of *parsing a context to obtain assertions*, the references cannot anticipate
independent claim 8 and dependent claim 12, which depends from independent claim

8. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Further, in paper #3, the Examiner rejected claims 2 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herman et al. in view of Buxton et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0089526). Further, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 4 as being unpatentable over Herman et al. and Buxton et al. in view of Golshani et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,850,631). Next, the Examiner rejected claims 5-7 and 18-20 as being unpatentable over Herman et al. in view of Tan (U.S. Patent Pub. No. US 2002/0138510). Thereafter, the Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 13, and 14 as being unpatentable over DeLong et al. in view of Gramlich (U.S. Patent No. 5,826,025) and rejected claim 11 as being unpatentable over DeLong et al. and Gramlich in view of Schaffer (U.S. Patent No. 5,911,041). Lastly, the Examiner rejected claim 17 as being unpatentable over Herman et al. and Buxton et al. in view of Golshani et al. Applicants respectfully traverse.

The Primary References: Herman et al. and DeLong et al.

Because independent claims 1, 8 and 15 are submitted to be allowable, Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims, which depend from the independent claims, are allowable for at least the same reasons.

The Remaining References: Buxton et al., Golshani et al., Tan, Gramlich, and Schaffer

Further, the Examiner stated that Buxton et al. discloses “wherein the plurality of classes includes a get assertion class that obtains assertions from the specification [paragraph 140] (page 3)” and that Golshani et al. discloses “the operation of obtaining a list of insertions from the specification using the get assertion class [abstract] (page 4).” The Examiner also stated that Tan discloses “wherein the plurality of classes includes a reporting class that provides information on test coverage of the specification [paragraph 20] (page 5)” and that Gramlich discloses “a code segment that filters the identified context prior to parsing the context [col. 2, lines 20-39] (page 7)” and “wherein each assertion comprises at least one sentence of the specification [col. 2, lines 20-39] (page 7).” Finally, the Examiner stated that Schaffer discloses “an assertion is an implied statement that can be tested [col. 1, lines 27-37] (page 9).”

Regarding the rejection of claims 2 and 16, Buxton et al. discloses a GUI for object-oriented applications. However, Buxton et al. does not disclose a computer program or method for testing a specification by obtaining a list of assertions from a context. The claimed invention further obtains the assertions by using a get assertion class. Because Buxton et al. does not teach the testing of a specification, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated by Buxton et al. to obtain assertions from a specification.

Next, regarding the rejection of claims 3, 4, and 17, Golshani et al. also discloses a GUI for database integrators to integrate two database schemas. However, Golshani et al. does not disclose a method for obtaining assertions from a

specification. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Golshani et al. to obtain assertions from a specification.

Further, regarding the rejection of claims 5-7 and 18-20, Tan discloses a tracking system and method for quality assurance processes over a network according to a test plan or test case specification. However, Tan does not disclose a *reporting class* or *assertions obtained from a specification*. Thus, Tan would not teach or motivate one of ordinary skill in the art the limitation recited in claims 5-7 and 18-20.

Regarding the rejection of claims 9, 10, 13, and 14, Gramlich discloses OreO, which filters and parses documents before being viewed on a Web browser. However, OreO does not parse the documents for assertions. Thus, Gramlich would not teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art how to filter specifications for assertions.

Finally, regarding the rejection of claim 11, Schaffer discloses a method for testing software where an assertion is a statement of how the software is expected to operate. However, Schaffer does not teach an *implied* statement. Because Schaffer does not teach an *implied* statement, the reference cannot teach or suggest to one of ordinary skill the limitations of claim 17 and base claim 15 and intervening claim 16.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references or in the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the references such that there is a reasonable expectation of success and that *the references must teach or suggest all the claim limitations* (MPEP 2143; MPEP 2143.03). Specifically, because the combination of the references do not teach or suggest all the claim limitations of the dependent claims including all the limitations from the base independent and intervening dependent claims, all the

Application No. 09/861,822
Office Action mailed 10/02/2003.
Response to Office Action mailed 1/02/2004.

dependent claims that depend from the allowable independent claims are submitted to be allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection.

Applicants respectfully request a Notice of Allowance based on the foregoing remarks. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the present amendment, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900. If any other fees are due in connection with filing this amendment, the Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No. SUNMP013). A copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP



Feb Cabrasawan
Reg. No. 51,521

Martine & Penilla, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, California 94086
Tel: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 32291